



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

REPORTS.

MNEMOSYNE, Vol. VII, Part III.

Cobet continues his annotations, critical and historical, on Plutarch's Life of M. Brutus. He first takes occasion, from the comparison of a passage in c. 22 with one in c. 45 of the Life of Cicero, to raise the question of the genuineness of the Correspondence of Cicero and Brutus, which forms the subject of a second long article in this number. He shows that many of Plutarch's expressions imply his acquaintance with these letters. For instance: Plutarch, Brut. 22, says that Brutus found great fault with Cicero for truckling to Octavianus from his hatred to Antonius, γράφων ὡς οὐ δεσπότην βαρύνειτο Κικέρων ἀλλὰ μισοῦντα δεσπότην φοβοῖτο καὶ πολιτεύειτο δουλείας αἵρεσιν φιλανθρώπων; and again, in Cic. 45, he quotes a letter of Brutus to Atticus in which he says that Cicero διὰ φόβον Ἀντωνίου θεραπέων τὸν Καίσαρα δῆλός ἐστιν οὐκ ἐλευθερίαν τῇ πατρίδι πρᾶττων ἀλλὰ δεσπότην φιλάνθρωπον αὐτῷ μνώμενος. With these passages is compared the letter of Brutus to Cicero (I 16, 6), *si Octavius tibi placet, a quo de nostra salute petendum sit, non dominum fugisse sed amiciorem dominum quae-sisse videberis*; and the same sentiment is more plainly expressed in a letter to Atticus (I 17, 4), (Cicero) *dum habeat a quibus impetret quae velit et a quibus colatur ac laudetur, servitutem, honorificam modo, non aspernatur*. Again: in Brut. 29 Plutarch says that Brutus wrote to Atticus, saying ἐν τῷ καλλίστῳ τῆς τύχης εἶναι τὰ κατ' αὐτόν· ἢ γὰρ νικήσας ἐλευθερώσειν τὸν Ῥωμαίων ἄνθρωπον ἢ δουλείας ἀποθάνων ἀπαλλαγίσσεσθαι. "Gemella his leguntur in Epist. I 16, 9, veluti '*si secuta fuerit, quae debet, fortuna gaudebimus omnes; sin minus ego tamen gaudebo. Quibus enim potius vita factis aut cogitationibus traducatur quam iis quae pertinent ad liberandos cives meos?*' in quibus est eximia quaedam εὐφημία, namque hoc dicit: *quid enim dulcius est quam pro libertate mori?*" Cobet quotes Orelli's opinion that the letters in question were composed by some rhetorician twenty or thirty years after Cicero's death, and says: "quid consilii hic rhetor secutus fuerit difficile dictu est. Utrum stili exercendi causa illa scripsit an ut lectoribus imponeret? Qui potuit, quum verae epistolae exstarent? Equidem (ut supra dixi) omnes esse genuinas existimo et ex maiore collectione excerptas."

A passage in Plutarch, Brut. 25, introduces a discussion of the events in Syria in B. C. 43, in the course of which Cobet takes occasion to refute one of Tunstall's criticisms on a letter of Brutus to Cicero (I 11, 1), in which he explains the statement that Antistius Vetus would have proved a hearty supporter "communis libertatis, si occasione potuisset occurrere" by saying: "the conjunction or occasion, then, of acting both against Caesar and Antony, at which Vetus could not be present, was no other than the battle of Modena." On this, after pointing out in a lucid way that the "occasion" was really the murder of Caesar the dictator, Cobet proceeds: "Praeterea si Tunstallum sequeris quid est *in Caesare?* in utro Caesare? dictatore an Octaviano? nempe

Octaviano, scilicet in bello et proelio Mutinensi. Potuitne igitur Vetus simul et Octaviano et Antonio in bello Mutinensi obsistere, quum Caesar acerrime cum Antonio depugnaret?"

Commenting on a passage in Brut. 40, 2, Cobet devotes several pages to an examination of the career of M. Valerius Messalla Corvinus, and, after quoting the letter from Cicero to Brutus (I 15), concludes with the words: "teneamus hoc: si forte haec non ab ipso Cicerone scripta sunt, *tamen eadem iisdem verbis a Cicerone verissime scribi potuisse.*"

After making many such observations, and in particular discussing the circumstances and the time of Porcia's death, which he maintains to have happened before that of Brutus, Cobet says: "quo saepius Bruti et Ciceronis Epistolas relego et ad illorum temporum historiam exigo et dicendi genus considero et animi sensus ac motus utriusque aut liquido apparentes aut facile pelluentes tota mente examino rerumque aliunde incognitarum notitiam animadverto, corroboratur mihi magis magisque suspicio *Epistolas hasce injuria Ciceroni et Bruto abiudicari.*"

In a second article of thirty-three pages Cobet treats directly of the letters of Cicero and Brutus. He expresses the highest admiration for the able manner in which K. F. Hermann defended the genuineness of the letters against Tunstall and Markland, of whom he says: "quid Cicero agat, quid consilii sequatur non magno opere cogitant aut explorant, sed exiles minutias veluti mures arroddunt. Quid? Cicero dixit *infideliter*, quod nemo unquam dixit. Nulla est dubitatio quin sit epistola spuria et supposita. Lepidum modo dixit *semper amicum*, modo *semper inimicum reipublicae* fuisse. Fieri non potest ut idem homo sit bonus et malus. Sine controversia epistola est a falsario ficta. Quanto melius et sanius Hermannus iudicat." Cobet does not, however, in all cases agree with Hermann. For example, on Epist. I 2, 3, "in hoc quoque vehementer ab Hermanno dissentio quod putat verba, *magis mihi probatur militum severitas quam tua*, sana et integra esse (*Vindic. Lat.* p. 40), nam ζῆγμα hoc esse et lenitas vel clementia ex opposito *severitas* cogitatione suppleri. Quis vidit unquam ζῆγμα in *magis-quam*? Orellius quoque defendit vulgatam ὀξύμωρον esse ratus, in quo τὸ μὲν μωρὸν video, τὸ δ' ὀξύ non video. Omnino aut lenitas aut clementia addendum."

On a passage in I 5, 3, in which Cicero begs Brutus to favor the admission of his son into the college of Pontifices, Cobet discusses the matter at length, and establishes, against Tunstall and Markland, (1) that the so-called *pontifices minores* were merely the *scribae pontificum*; (2) that C. Marius was made augur after his sixth consulship *ex lege Domitia*; (3) that youth was no bar to such advancement; (4) that the verb *cooptare* continued to be applied to these elections, even after, in consequence of the *Lex Domitia*, it ceased to be appropriate. He refers to a paper by Ch. Giraud, in the *Journal des Savants*, in which an account is given of an inscription recently discovered in Spain, and the inference is drawn that "la lettre à Brutus n'est pas l'oeuvre de l'imagination inventive d'un faussaire."

One of Markland's objections to the genuineness of these letters is founded on the fact that in I 15, 3, Solon is called "sapientissimus ex septem," while in de Legg. II 11 Thales is declared to be so. "One of the two Ciceros must have made a great mistake." Upon this Cobet remarks, "si foret in terris rideret

Cicero quum audiret suo iudicio et testimonio constitui quis esset inter septem omnium sapientissimus. De septem sapientibus Cicero non multo plura quam nos noverat, id est propemodum nihil, poteratque unusquisque eorum per vices sapientissimus nominari."

Upon Markland's objection to Epist. II 1, on the ground of its containing the ἀπαξ εἰρημένον *infideliter*, Cobet has some excellent remarks, saying, "optimum quemque scriptorem Latinum pro re nata vocabula nova ex certa analogia sibi fingere, eaque omnia, si modo idonea sint et venusta et aurem non laedant, perinde esse proba et Latina atque ea quae frequenti omnium usu terantur. Cavendum tantum erat ne quis σκληρά et μοχθηρά et κακόφωνα fingeret, in caeteris analogiam ducem tuto sequebantur."

J. J. Cornelissen proposes a satisfactory emendation of Pliny, H. N. XVI 1, 1, writing, *aeternam pariens rerum naturae controversiam dubiamque, terrae sitne pars an maris*.

H. T. Karsten: several omissions and emendations in Cicero, *pro Flacco*.

J. J. Cornelissen proposes emendations in eighteen passages of the Achilleis of Statius. The following may be taken as a specimen:

178. "Protinus ille subit rapido, quae proxima, saltu Flumina, fumantesque genas crinemque novatur Fontibus." "Pro ridiculo *fumantesque* scribendum est *fuscantesque*. 'Fuscare' pro 'fuscum esse' Statiano dicendi generi consentaneum est. cf. Silv. III 4, 66: pulchrae fuscaret gratia formae. Vs. 159 narravit poeta, Achillem pulvere obsitum fuisse."

H. Van Herwerden continues his emendations of Lucian, of which some specimens may be of interest:

In 490 (Reitz.) he insists on ὃ φίλτατον Ἑρμῆδιον after the analogy of γῆριον, κλήριον, and predicts that Fritzsche will restore to Lucian διολισθάνοντες (for -θαιν-) and in 493 συστεῖλαι for στείλαι "quod miro iudicio edidit Jacobitzius."

In 494 he objects to ἀρ'οὖν ὁ Καύκασος ἐπιτήδειος ἢ ὁ Παρνασὸς ὑψηλότερος ἢ ἀμφοῖν ὁ Ὀλυμπος ἐκείνοσί, on the ground that Mercury, god as he was, must have known the relative heights of the mountains, and that anyhow he didn't need to be instructed by Charon. He would write, therefore, ἢ ὑψηλότερος ἀμφοῖν (ὦν) ὁ Ὀλυμπος. It is not surprising, he says, that Lucian should not have known that Caucasus was really higher than either of the others.

In p. 498, ἀλλὰ βούλει καὶ κατὰ τὸν Ὅμηρον ἐρήσομαι σε he thinks we must either read, with Cobet, εἰ βούλει, or change ἐρήσομαι to ἐρωμαι.

In p. 510, εὖ γε παρωδεῖς ἦδη, ὦ Χάρων, he objects to ἦδη, as Charon had done very well (pp. 499 and 501) with his Homeric adaptations.

In *de Sacrif.*, p. 536, he expresses his surprise that no one has yet suggested the emendation of τὰ ἐγκατα ἐξαίρων by reading ἐξαίρων, comparing Prometh. 20 τὰ ἐγκατα ἐξαίρσοντας.

In *Vitar. auct.*, p. 550, καὶ τὸ ἐρυθριᾶν ἀπόξεσον τοῦ προσώπου παντελῶς, he corrects ἀπόξυσσον, comparing Alciph. III 40, τὴν αἰδῶ τῶν προσώπων ἀπόξυσσαι [in his note on this passage Bergler quotes Lucian with ἀπόξυσσον], and remarks that the MSS. constantly confuse ξύειν *radere* and ξείν *polire, laevigare*.

In p. 562, ἀπορῶ γὰρ ὁ πρότερον εἰπὼν ἀπολάβοιμι, he remarks that regular syntax would require ἀπολάβω. "Sed Lucianus in utriusque modi, coniunctivi et optativi, usu parum accuratus fuisse videtur."

In *Piscat.*, p. 591, ἡμεῖς δ' ἐν τοσοῦτῳ προσκνήσωμεν τῇ θεῷ, as read by Jacobitz and Fritzsche, he follows one MS. in substituting τῇ θεῷ, "quo casu constanter noster ad Atticorum exemplum in hoc verbo usus est. Προσκνέειν τινι aequè vitiosum est quam προσαγορεύειν τινί, et faeci Graeculorum relinquendum."

In p. 596 he condemns Fritzsche for allowing οὔτε ἐορτῆς ἐπιούσης, *neque festo appropinquante*, to stand, on the ground that "effrenata illa dicendi libertas et petulantia" was tolerated not before but during the Dionysia. He suggests οὔσης, or the reading of Φ ἐφείσης, and says, "operae pretium est videre, quantopere homines docti horreant probabilem lectionem e codice minus bono (Φ tamen minime spernendus) prolatam, ita ut haud raro felix veteris correctoris emendatio loco alicui magis fere obsit quam prosit."

In *Catapl.*, p. 626, he again objects to ἐκτεθειμένων as a perfect passive, thinking that here the reading of some MSS., ἐκτιθεμένων (*qui exponerantur*), suits the sense better. "Perfecto ne locus quidem est Graece, ubi actionis effectus non permanet, nec infantes abducti a Mercurio amplius ἐξέκειντο. Confunditur enim perpetuo in his fabulis umbrarum et cadaverum notio."

Emendations are proposed also on the *de mercede conductis*, *Apologia*, *Pro lapsu in salut.*, and *Hermotimus*. In the last, p. 783, τὸν μὲν τὸ ἄλφα ἔχοντα τῷ τὸ ἕτερον ἄλφα ἀνεσπακότι παλαίειν—καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους τοὺς ὁμογράμμους κατὰ ταῦτά, he approves of Fritzsche's change of τοὺς ὁμογ. into the dative, but adds, "sed simul corrigere debuerat τοῖς ὁμογραμμάτοις, siquidem ὁμόγραμμα, formatum α γραμμῇ, *linea*, significat. *qui cum alio communem habet lineam*, ὁμογράμματος vero, derivatum α γράμμα, *littera*, *qui eandem habet litteram*, quod est huius loci."

In *Hermot.* 793 he approves of Fritzsche's reading βίῳ for βιώσει, remarking that Lucian "ad veterum Ionum aequaliumque suorum exemplum uti solet in praesenti forma βιῶ pro Attico ζῶ, et aoristo βιώσαι pro Attico βιδῶναι, unde fit ut βιῳ, qui aoristi optativus est antiquis, praesentis fiat apud Lucianum." If ἦν is retained we must read βιῳ (βιωί?), "nam aoristum ferri non posse certum est."

PART IV.

H. Van Herwerden continues his criticism of the text of Lucian. Sixty pages of this number are thus filled. He passes in review all the tracts contained in the second and third volumes of the Teubner edition. As most of these have now undergone the critical care of Fritzsche, Van H. does not find much that is novel or striking to say; and many of his observations are repeated several times, as often as an expression or word occurs which he deems non-Lucianic. For example: he more than once substitutes the middle for the active form of the perfect of ἀνολύνναι: he changes repeatedly κορυφαϊότατος to κορυφαῖος: he again and again removes ἐκ from before the genitive of material, substitutes δὴ for ἦδη, *perì* for *ὑπέρ* in the sense of 'concerning,' gives the Attic for the uncontracted form of such futures as ἐλάσσοντας, omits the preposition in such expressions as βδεύουσι τινες ἐς τὰ ἦδη, substitutes ὑπό for ἀπό before the genitive of the agent, and changes the optative to the past indicative after final particles depending upon an unfulfilled condition.

There is not much in this article which can be extracted, as being of general interest apart from its context. Occasionally he disapproves of Fritzsche's decisions. For example, in *Zeuxis*, p. 847: for the φοβηθήσονται of Fr. he desires to substitute φοβήσονται, as in *Dial. Mort.* XXIII 3, etc. In *Harmo-*

nides, p. 854, he insists on changing ἐφθη ποιῶσαι into ποιήσας, remarking that such a solecism may be tolerated "apud Plutarchum similesque," but not in Lucian. In Quomodo Historia sit Scribenda, p. 31 : ὥστε τὸ πρῶγμα εἰκοὸς εἶναι τραγῳδῶ τὸν ἕτερον μὲν πόδα ἐπ' ἐμβάτον ὑψηλοῦ ἐπιβεβηκότι, θάτερον δὲ σανδάλῳ ὑποδεδεμένῳ, his note is: "Conspirant in hac lectione optimi codices, nec tamen ita is scribere potuit, qui in Pseudolog. cap. 29 tam acerbè perstringit hominem dicentem: 'Ἀπέκτεινε θάτερον τῶν πενήτων. Nec tulit eam stribliginem Fritzschius, qui ex duobus libris recepit θατέρῳ δὲ σάνδαλον ὑποδεδεμένῳ. Equidem praetulerim τὸν ἕτερον δὲ σάνδαλον ὑποδεδεμένῳ. Vix enim recte dicitur: ὑποδεδεμαι τῷ ποδὶ σάνδαλον s. σανδάλιον."

p. 64, he prefers to write ἀνὰ λόγον τοῖς πράγμασι (rather than ἀνάλογον), "quod cum Dativo construi nihil vetat, siquidem, ut hoc utar, περὶ πόδα eundem casum asciscit supra cap. 14 [περὶ πόδα τῇ ἱστορίᾳ]."

In Vera Historia, p. 90, τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς περιαιρετοὺς ἔχουσι, he suspects περιαιρετοὺς on the ground that περιαιρεῖν can be applied with propriety only to things which surround something else, as τεῖχος, στέφανον, ταυρίαν, δακτύλιον, χιτῶνα, δέρμα, and metaphorically of what can be so conceived, as χρήματα, ὄπλα, συμμάχους, ἀξίωμα, ἐξουσίαν, κάλλος and the like. As immediately after we have καὶ ὁ βουλούμενος ἐξελὼν τοὺς αὐτοῦ τυφλώττει ἐστ' ἂν δεηθῇ ἰδεῖν· οὕτω δ' ἐνθήμερος ὄρε', he thinks we should read in the former sentence τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς γὰρ ἐξαιρετοὺς ἔχουσι.

In ὀρώμεν θηρία καὶ κῆτη πολλὰ μὲν καὶ ἄλλα ἐν δὲ μέγιστον ἀπάντων (p. 94), he follows Mehler in bracketing καὶ κῆτη: [Is not καὶ here epeexegetic, as in Thucyd. I 80, 3? See Shilleto's note.]

On the concluding words (p. 141) ἐν τοῖς ἐξῆς βιβλίοις δηλώσομεν [sic. Luc. διηγῆσομαι] he remarks: "hinc male concludas revera scriptorem id fecisse, sed sequentes libros temporis iniuria interiisse. Promissum aequè verum videtur ac tota Vera Historia."

On Tyrannicida, p. 158, μαρτυρούμενον ὅτι μοι πιστῶς διηκονήσατο he says: "notandus est usus verbi medii μαρτυρεῖσθαι pro μαρτυρεῖν ἐαντῷ, non observatus, ut videtur, a lexicographis."

On de Saltat. p. 273, Πυρρίχιον ἀπ' αὐτοῦ κεκλῆμενον he refers to the lines of Eur. Androm. 1135 : δεινὰς δ' ἂν εἶδες πυρρίχας φρονουμένους βέλεμνα παιδός, κ. τ. λ., saying that the commentators have missed this confirmation of the supposed connection of the Pyrrhic dance with Neoptolemus.

On p. 285 after it is said that the objection to mimic dancing, that men enact the parts of women, would apply equally to tragedy and comedy, the text continues: πλείους γοῦν ἐν αὐταῖς τῶν ἀνδρῶν αἱ γυναῖκες; upon this H. remarks: "at in plerisque fabulis utriusque generis ipsum contrarium obtinet, neque id ignorare potuit Lucianus." He therefore attributes these words to some Byzantine scribe who knew nothing about the ancient drama and had in his mind the mimes of his own day.

On the Asinus, p. 529, καὶ τράπεζα μὴδὲν ἔχουσα παρέκειτο, he proposes to insert πω after μὴδὲν, for though Hipparchus has been described as φίλαργωρώτατος δεινῶς, it does not follow that such persons are mean, and Lucius himself declares that he was handsomely entertained, and the subsequent meal is described as οὐ σφόδρα λιτόν. On μὴδὲν he remarks: "in usu τοῦ μὴδὲν pro οὐδὲν in hoc scriptore, qui cum Luciano nihil habet commune, non haerendum est." Further

on, remarking on the number of marginal glosses which have crept into the text of the Asinus, he says, "unde suspiceris hunc libellum propter portentosum et spurcum argumentum eximie placuisse antiquis et assidue lectitatum esse."

For ἀπεκρέμα, p. 599, he prefers the reading of a good MS. ἀπεκρίμνα, and says he is sure such a form is genuine. "Ut ex κεραννίναi fit κερνάναi, ex πεταννίναi πιτνάναi, ex σκεδαννίναi σκιδνάναi, ex πέλειν (sic) πιλνάναi ita a κρεμαννίναi ductum esse κριμνάναi potius quam κρημνάναi veri videtur simillimum."

On Juppiter Tragoedus, p. 682, he points out the fact, hitherto unnoticed, that the lines put into the mouth of Hermagoras are a parody on Eurip. Orest. 871.

On Calumnia, p. 141, διαβάλλεται μὲν οὖν ὡς τὸ πολὺν μάλιστα ὁ τιμώμενος καὶ διὰ τοῦτο τοῖς ὑπολείπομένοις αὐτοῦ ἐπίφθορος, he bids us write ἀπολείπομένοις, "nam ἀπολείπεσθαι τινος (non ὑπολείπεσθαι) dicuntur qui post aliquem relinquuntur, quae locutio proprio sensu de currentibus in stadio, figurato de vitae curriculo usurpari assolet."

On de Dea Syria, p. 472, τὰ οὐν πᾶμπαν ἐπανέω, ὡς σχέτλιε, ὅς τοιάδε ἐτλης, οἷα μήτε σὲ παθεῖν μήτε ἐμὲ ιδέσθαι ὤφελεν, he remarks: "haec verba prodeunt (sic) scriptorem bonae Graecitatis ita ignarum, ut sufficiant, ut hunc libellum Luciano abiudicemus. Ex cap. 60, paene suspiceris scriptorem natione esse Troezenium."

H. T. Karsten comments on Cicero, de domo, de haruspicum responso, and post reditum in senatu. He indicates passages which he regards as interpolated, and others which require emendation. His suggestions are of different degrees of weight. A favorable specimen is the following, de domo § 109: "*Quid est sanctius, quid omni religione munitius quam domus unius cuiusque civium? . . . Quo magis est istius furor ab . . . auribus vestris repellendus, qui quae maiores nostri religionibus tuta nobis et sancta esse voluerunt, ea i s te non solum contra religionem labefactavit, sed etiam ipsius religionis nomine evertit.* Non ab auribus sed a domibus tribunicium furorem repellerent cives monuit orator, § 106: *ius igitur statuētis esse uniuscuiusque vestrum sedes, aras, focos, deos penates subiectos esse libidini tribuniciae?* Itaque restituendum *aedibus*. Mox secludendum *iste*."

Cobet has an article on Ruhnken's Disputatio de vita et scriptis Longini. He controverts Ruhnken's opinion that Longinus was an Athenian citizen, on the ground that (1) it is incredible "*civem Atheniensem* popularium et aequalium omnium doctissimum—aeate provectum Athenis et Graeca humanitate relictis ultro in Syriam abiisse, id est ad barbaros in oppidum ubi neque librorum esset copia neque eorum, qui libros Graecos describere possent. Non erat haec civi Attico, criticorum principi, vita vitalis": (2) that, as Zenobia spoke Greek excellently and is said to have been taught by Longinus, it is absurd to suppose that she acquired this power when she was busy with the affairs of empire and was long past the age when such studies are pursued with success. "*Zenobia igitur ineunte aetate diu ante matrimonium Longino magistro ad Graecas literas usa erat, et Longinus non erat Athenis sed in ipsa Syria in proximo.*" He then proceeds at some length to show that Longinus was probably born, passed much of his life, and was at last put to death by Aurelian, at Emesa. He disbelieves the story of Zenobia's being led in triumph, and prefers the account of Zosimus αὐτὴν Τηροβίαν φασὶν ἢ νόσῳ ληφθεῖσαν ἢ τροφῆς μεταλαβεῖν οὐκ ἀνασχο-

μένην ἀποθάνειν. He also expresses a confident opinion that the treatise *περὶ ὕψους* was not written by Longinus, but by some far earlier rhetorician, who "Caecilio aequalis in cruda servitute quum superessent etiam morientis libertatis vestigia" wrote certain passages which seem to indicate an experience of life and manners which Longinus could not have had.

Cobet has also a series of interesting remarks on the Scholia in *Odysseam* (Oxford, 1855). A single specimen may be quoted, "Odys. B. 373, Bekkerus edidit: ἄλλ' ὁμοσον μὴ μητρὶ φίλῃ τάδε μυθήσασθαι. Scholion: γρ. (i. e. γραπτέον) διὰ τοῦ Ε μυθήσασθαι. Antiquissimum hoc est erroris genus, quo *futuri* et *aoristi* formae et in infinitivis et in participiis temere et inconsulto inter se permisceantur cum sententiae detrimento vel cum barbarismo et soloecismo. 'Ὁμοσον μὴ μυθήσασθαι est: da iusiurandum te non DIXISSE. Neque Bekkerus hoc sentiebat, neque longe maxima pars eorum, qui scriptores Graecos nunc edunt id sentire videntur."

Referring to the cruelties inflicted on Melanthius *Odys. X 474*, he says: "non sunt haec καταπληκτικά, sed βδελυρά τε καὶ μισρά, and after quoting corresponding *threats* from the "poeta vetus" in *Il. Ψ. 20, Odys. Σ. 86*, he says, "arripuit haec aut aliquanto deterior cantor aut διασκεναστῆς nescio quis, et quas animus ardens minas iecerat inanes, eas poenas a misero Melanthio intolerabili saevitia sumtos esse fingit, et addidit etiam de suo aliquid, χεῖράς τ' ἡδὲ πόδας κόπτων, quasi nondum esset satis. Praeterea multum dubito an *praecidere manus* Graece dici possit χεῖρας κόπτειν pro ἀποκόπτειν."

This number contains also emendations by Cobet of passages in *Diodorus Siculus*; and a comparison of the text of *Thucydides* (*II 75*—in the edition of *Herwerden* which he highly commends), with a fragment he has himself copied in the *Paris library*.

On *Gellius, N. A. I 18, 5*, "*nonne sic videtur Varro de fure tamquam Aelius de lepore?*" he says: "Excidit vocabulum sententiae necessarium; de lepore *ERRARE*. Varro serio credebatur et graviter docebat: 'FUREM ex eo dictum quod veteres Romani FURVUM atrum appellaverint et fures per noctem quae atra sit facilius furari.' Multo melius Etymologi a *furvo* appellati fuissent. Nihil enim absurdius esse potest quam sunt Stoicorum, Ictorum, Antiquariorum et Grammaticorum Etymologiae. Exemplo esto quod Verrius Flaccus apud Gellium *XVI 14, 3*, excogitavit: 'FESTINAT, inquit, a FANDO dicitur, quoniam isti ignaviores, qui nihil perficere possunt, plus verborum quam operae habent.' Has ineptias ne Gellius quidem devorare potuit, qui addit: 'sed id nimis coactum atque absurdum videtur neque tanti esse momenti potest prima in utroque verbo litera ut propter eam unam tam diversa verba FESTINARE et FARI eadem videri debeant.' Stoici autem non dubitabant quin NEPTUNUS a NANDO nomen haberet."

C. D. MORRIS.

ANGLIA. Zeitschrift für englische Philologie. Herausgegeben von R. P. WÜLCKER und M. TRAUTMANN. II Band. Halle, 1879.

I.—J. Phelan, Memphis, U. S. A., opens the first number of the second volume of the *Anglia* with a long article on 'Philip Massinger, his Life and Plays.' Massinger's father was in the service of the Earl of Pembroke, and under the Earl's patronage Massinger entered Oxford in 1602, but left without taking a

degree, most probably because he became a Roman Catholic while at college, and this also caused the withdrawal of the Earl's favor. We know little of his life in London until 1622, when he wrote plays on his own account, having previously been a collaborator with Fletcher. Phelan considers him as modest and retiring, reverent and never profane, naturally pure, but yielding to the tendencies of the age, and hence justly accused of obscenity. Thirty-one plays attributed to Massinger are briefly noticed, but of some of these merely the title is known, and others were simply altered by Massinger from older plays. Phelan hopes to have added some facts of the poet's life not known to his previous biographers.

H. Krebs contributes some remarks on The Anglo-Saxon Translation of the Dialogues of Pope Gregory, of which work he will soon publish an edition. The translation is not by King Alfred, but by Werferth, Bishop of Worcester, 873-915, and is by no means literal. We possess three MSS. of it, not five, as Wanley says, but only one of these is complete. Krebs gives King Alfred's short preface, and the beginning and end of the translation.

H. Varnhagen supplies nine verses of the Middle-English Poem 'Long Life,' from Dan Michel's Ayenbite of Inwyrt, which vary from the MSS. noticed by Zupitza in Anglia I 410, and were probably cited from memory by Dan Michel.

W. Sattler continues his useful examples of The Use of Prepositions in Modern English with—IV, *in—at—on*, and V, *to part from—to part with*. No collection of examples so complete has been made, as far as I know, by any English grammarian.

R. Köhler finds still another German story similar to Chaucer's Miller's Tale in a book published in the second half of the seventeenth century with the curious title, 'Lyrum Larum Seu Nugae Venales Ioco Seriae.' He also supplies the song from which a verse, relating to the Man in the Moon, is given in Rowley's play, 'When you see me, you know me.'

R. Wülcker furnishes from Grein's papers a copy of Aelfric's Anglo-Saxon paraphrase of the Book of Judges arranged in metrical long lines, Grein having published it as prose in his Bibliothek der A. S. Prosa. The alliterative feature of this work had been long since noticed by Dietrich in his monograph on the Abbot Aelfric (Z. für die hist. Theol., bde. 25, 26).

M. Trautmann presents a very interesting investigation of Layamon's Verse. After giving the views heretofore expressed, which are 'contradictory enough,' he states that Layamon's Verse has a great similarity to that of Otfrid and the Middle High German verse of four accents. Nine points are given in which this is shown by comparison; and the first five hundred lines of Layamon's Brut are subjected to a careful examination, with the result that nine-tenths of them fulfil the laws of Otfrid's verse. Trautmann then seeks the origin of this verse, which he finds—*not* with Lachmann in the Old German and Anglo-Saxon alliterative half-line, but with Wackernagel—in the iambic dimeter acatalectic of the Latin church-hymns. Examining the first fifty half-lines of 'Beowulf,' he shows that not more than one-third comply with the rules for Otfrid's verse, and concludes that the view that the Old German alliterative half-line has four accents is no longer tenable. Heyne, however, in his 'Beowulf,' is a strong supporter of this view, and employs some Procrustean pro-

cesses to sustain it; and Prof. March, in his Anglo-Saxon Reader, follows him. We can at least be grateful to Trautmann for having vindicated the rhythm of Layamon's verse, which even Mr. A. J. Ellis pronounces as "very irregular and little better than prose."

K. Elze suggests certain emendations in two stanzas of Dryden's *Annus Mirabilis*, but Dryden is too modern a writer to practice on in this style, and we must leave him to the tender mercies of Mr. Furnivall.

W. Wagner rightly corrects two notes in his edition of Marlowe's *Faustus*:

B. Ten Brink closes the first part of this number with some additions and corrections to his *Englische Lautlehre in Anglia* I 517.

In the Book Notices D. Asher reviews Warnke and Proescholdt's edition of 'The Comedy of Mucedorus'; W. Hertzberg discusses at some length A. Schmidt's edition of Shakespeare's 'Coriolanus,' which is frequently referred to with respect by W. A. Wright in his C. P. edition of that play; J. Zupitza notices a Heidelberg inaugural dissertation by A. Tanner on 'The Romance of Guy of Warwick'; and R. P. Wülcker reviews with much commendation the first volume of B. Ten Brink's 'History of English Literature' (Berlin, 1877), which comes down to Wiclif. Wülcker considers, and rightly, that a new history of the earlier English literature was a pressing want, which has now been supplied by Ten Brink, who promises an 'Outline' which shall give the sources for the results stated without references in this 'History.' While taking exceptions to some statements made by Ten Brink, Wülcker's opinion is that this is the first successful attempt to write a *history of English literature*, i. e. of the literary development of the English people, instead of giving, as heretofore, a view of the Anglo-Saxon and Early English literary monuments. [A similar attempt, and a very commendable one as far as it goes, has been made by Brother Azarias, in his 'Development of English Literature: Old English Period,' which includes the Anglo-Saxon literature.] Ten Brink's work is to be in four volumes. The present one reaches Wiclif and Chaucer, and is divided into four books, the first extending to the Norman Conquest—the most thorough critical treatment of Anglo-Saxon literature that has yet been made; the second, to King Henry III, including the Anglo-Norman and so-called Semi-Saxon literature; the third, from Edward I to about 1350; and the fourth introducing Wiclif and Chaucer. Wülcker concludes his notice with the statement that the book is a popular work in the highest sense, and deserves to be read by the learned as well as the great public, offering much instruction to both.

II and III.—The second and third parts of the second volume form a double number. H. Suchier begins this with an article on the Versification of the Anglo-Normans, which is chiefly taken up with combating criticisms made by Koschwitz in the *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie* II 338, on a treatise of Suchier's entitled 'Über die Matthaeus Paris zugeschriebene Vie de seint Auban,' in which he had tried to discover the laws of Anglo-Norman versification.

H. Varnhagen gives the text of three Middle English Poems: I. The Disputation between the Body and the Soul (536 verses). This well-known poem

appears in mediaeval literature in different languages. At least nine English copies exist, of which two are Old English [Anglo-Saxon] and the rest Middle English. Varnhagen prints the same form of the poem as heretofore printed by Thomas Wright and by Mätzner, but from a different MS. (Brit. Mus., Royal 18 A X). His notes contain readings from four other MSS., and a collation to Mätzner's text of the Laud MS. (A. E. Sprachproben, I 92). II. A Song to the Virgin (53 verses), from the Digby MS. 127, heretofore printed from another MS. by Wright, Wülcker and Böddeker, all of whom assumed some connection between this poem and the 'Stabat Mater,' which is denied by Varnhagen and by Ten Brink. III. A Riddle (five verses), from MS. Egerton 1995, of the fifteenth century.

S. Levy combats the view of C. S. Weiser (Anglia I 252), that Byron's 'Hints from Horace' was imitated from Pope's Essay on Criticism, while acknowledging that Pope's influence on Byron's earlier poems was very great.

W. Sattler continues his examples of The Use of Prepositions in Modern English with—VI, *born of*.

F. Charitius subjects to a very full and thorough examination the Anglo-Saxon Poems about St. Guthlac. The question of the authorship of the poems attributed to Cynewulf was fully discussed by Wülcker (Anglia I 483), with the result that the Christ, Helena, Juliana and some of the Riddles are the only genuine poems of Cynewulf, thus confuting the views of Dietrich, Leo and Rieger. Rieger noticed that the Guthlac-legend consisted of two different parts, A=1-790, B=791-1353, but both were attributed by him and by Ten Brink to Cynewulf. Charitius makes a very full comparison of these poems (the details of which lack of space prevents me from giving) with the genuine poems of Cynewulf, and concludes, from the character of the versification, the use of substantive-compounds, and the phraseology, both in use of single words and of phrases and combinations of words, that A and B are by different writers, that B is by Cynewulf, and that he was acquainted with A, which was written somewhere about 730-740 A. D. The investigation is very interesting, and deserves the careful attention of all Anglo-Saxon students.

W. Wagner remarks on Marlowe's Faust that it was in the hands of the 'Lord Admiral's Men' before November, 1589, hence Marlowe could *not* have used the English Faust-book (which first appeared 1592), as Düntzer assumes. (Anglia I 47). Marlowe used the German Faust-book directly, and the English translator used Marlowe's drama.

O. Schöpke contributes an essay on Dryden's Paraphrase of Chaucer's Poems, discussing the relation of these 'Fables' of Dryden to their originals. After a synopsis of Dryden's Introduction, he treats—I, Palamon and Arcite (The Knight's Tale), and—II, The Cock and the Fox (The Nun's Priest's Tale), and concludes, after a lengthy examination of each, that Dryden has worked with great freedom, having made some changes, omitted much, enlarged somewhat, and introduced a great number of new thoughts. The metre is preserved, but mixed. The diction of Chaucer is simple, that of Dryden ornate.

R. P. Wülcker reports on his examination of Manuscripts in English Libraries: I. Salisbury and London; II. Exeter. From the former he gives—1, the *Te deum laudamus*; 2, the Hymn of Athanasius *De fide trinitatis*; 3, the fourth

Psalm in four MSS.—all accompanied by interlinear Anglo-Saxon glosses; also from Salisbury the beginning of a MS. of Chaucer's Boethius, which was unknown to Morris when he published his edition for the E. E. T. Society. From Exeter, out of the well-known Exeter-Book, he gives critical texts of two A. S. poems, the Message of the Husband to his Wife, and the Ruin, with remarks on each, correcting the texts of Thorpe, Grein and Schipper.

R. Köhler quotes several lines from the beginning of the English poem, 'How the Plowman learned his Pater Noster,' and furnishes four prose versions of the same story, one Italian, one Latin, one German, and the beginning of an English translation of a French version.

M. Trautmann prints the Early English poem, 'Golagrus and Gawain,' preceded by an introduction on its origin, contents and source, language, time and author. It is known from a volume printed at Edinburgh in 1508, long lost but rediscovered and presented to the Library of the Faculty of Advocates in 1788, reprinted in *facsimile* 1827, and again from this edition by Sir Frederic Madden for the Bannatyne Club in 1839. It was printed also by Pinkerton in his 'Scottish Poems,' 1792. Madden thinks it borrowed from the French romance 'Perceval,' by Chrestien; Trautmann thinks it indirectly borrowed, as the name Golagrus is not in Chrestien. The language is Scotch, time, the end of the fifteenth century, and author, probably Clerk of Tranent, not Huchown, as some think. As the other editions are rare, Trautmann reprints it with some corrections.

A. Fritzsche contributes a carefully studied article on 'The Anglo-Saxon Poem Andreas and Cynewulf.' His introduction notices briefly all that has been written about Cynewulf and the Andreas from the printing of the Codex Vercellensis by Thorpe in 'Cooper's Report,' and Grimm's edition of 'Andreas and Elene,' 1840, to Wülcker's article on Cynewulf in Anglia I, and that of Charitius (see above) in the present volume. He also combats Dietrich's views, and then examines the sources of Cynewulf's genuine poems and of the Andreas, the contents of the Andreas, its verse, style and language, vocabulary and borrowings, and sums up his conclusions as follows: I. Andreas is no work of Cynewulf, as shown by—I, the different treatment of the sources; 2, differences in respect to the verse; 3, the language; 4, the vocabulary; and 5, the runes forming Cynewulf's name are lacking. II. Andreas is by a scholar or imitator of Cynewulf, who was acquainted with other Anglo-Saxon works, as shown by—I, the choice of subject; 2, numerous borrowings from Cynewulf; and 3, agreements with the vocabulary of 'Beowulf.' A very thorough investigation of the subject has led to these conclusions, and it must be admitted that this article of Fritzsche and the above-mentioned one of Charitius are important contributions to the Cynewulf-question and to Anglo-Saxon philology.

R. P. Wülcker has an appreciative obituary notice of the distinguished scholar, Thomas Wright, who died December 23, 1877. While denying to him the title of philologist, he fully recognizes his antiquarian and archaeological learning and his zeal for his favorite pursuits. Some of the most important of Wright's works are omitted in the notice, and notably his edition of 'Piers Plowman' and his 'Celt, Roman and Saxon.'

Wülcker also supplies corrections to Anglia II 253 and II 230.

F. J. Furnivall closes this portion of the volume with Two Protests, one against Dr. Phelan, in his article on Massinger, and the other against Dr. Elze, on Dryden. His criticism of the latter's emendation is manifestly correct, but its tone is rightly objected to by Dr. Elze (p. 548).

The Book Notices open with J. Schipper's notice of K. Bøddeker's 'Old English Poems from MS. Harl. 2253.' He finds but one of these thirteenth century poems, 'Marina,' which has not already been printed, and thinks a new edition was unnecessary, that the texts were not suitable for an introduction to the study of Old English, and that the grammatical introduction is defective. Schipper's first objection is not valid; there is room enough for many more such works—the more the better—and every school-book should have a grammatical outline of the Old English dialects prefixed, notwithstanding the eminent services of Koch and Morris, or rather in consequence of them. Schipper gives Bøddeker credit for improved texts, and, while correcting some errors, pronounces the glossary 'a valuable contribution to English lexicography,' which is itself a sufficient justification for the work.

L. Proescholdt notices Three Shakespeare Studies by E. Hermann. Part I, 'The importance of the Midsummernight's Dream for Shakespeare-biography and the history of the English drama.'

W. Wagner compares his own edition of Marlowe's Faustus (London, 1877) and Ward's edition of Marlowe's Faustus and Greene's Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay (Oxford, 1878).

E. Sievers finds many corrections necessary in Leo's Anglo-Saxon Glossary. A list of over *four* pages is given as the result of an examination of the first 120 pages of the work. While recognizing Leo's great services to Anglo-Saxon studies, Sievers thinks he was not a philologist in the strict sense of the word: he lacked accuracy in investigation. He concludes, then, that the work is only valuable as an *index verborum* to a number of sources, heretofore imperfectly or not at all used, and so welcome as a contribution to Anglo-Saxon lexicography.

J. Koch reviews the Latest Publications of the Chaucer Society, 1876; and D. Asher notices Sainte-Claire's Dictionary of English, French and German Idioms.

The volume closes with a valuable bibliography of books and essays in English philology which appeared during the year 1876.

JAMES M. GARNETT.

REVUE DE PHILOGIE, IV 2, pp. 111-144.

I. pp. 111-117. The future imperative (by Charles Thurot). Neue (II 400 ff.) collects many examples of imperatives in *-to*, *-nto*, *-tor*, *-ntor*, referring to the distant future, but opposes to them some examples which, he thinks, throw some doubt upon the ordinary distinction. Thurot examines the examples cited by Neue, and concludes that, although the present may be employed for the remote as well as the immediate future, the future form relates to the immediate future in too few instances to justify us in denying that it regularly refers to the remote future.

2. p. 117. H. W. changes Ἐγνώκα τοῖσδε (Prom. 51) into Ἐγνώκα· τίς δ' οὐ ;
3. pp. 118-120. Notes on Xenophon (by O. Riemann). (a) On ἀνοίγω: in Hell. I 1, 2, I 5, 13, I 6, 21, change ἦνοιγε, ἦνοιξεν, ἦνοιγον into ἦνυτε, ἦνυσεν, ἦνυτον (the Attic orthography requiring the aspirate in this word). (b) Hell. I 1, 35, which implies that the sea off Peiraieus can be seen from Dekeleia is not to be changed, as some think, for that portion of the sea *can* be seen from the eminence of Παλαιόκαστρον.
4. p. 120. E. Chatelain places *en* before *Agrigentini* in Sidon. Apol. II 367.
5. pp. 121-124. Further discussion of the fragment of Eur. Melanippe, recently discovered by Blass. Text printed in full, with restorations (by Henri Weil).
6. p. 124. Henri Weil changes οὐδέ οἱ ἵπποι (Il. XII 49) into οὐδέ τῷ ἵππῳ.
7. p. 125. Note on a MS. of Florence containing some letters of Seneca (by E. Chatelain). Shows that this MS., which has never been used in editing Seneca, is of great importance.
8. pp. 126-7. O. R. shows that the omission of *animus* in Liv. XXII 5, 8 by Madvig is supported by Orosius, who drew from Livy.
9. p. 127. H. W. puts ἐμπεριφανόμενον for ἐν περιφανομένῳ in the second epigram in his *Papyrus inédit*.
10. p. 127. O. R., defending ἡγγέλης in Iph. Taur. 932, cites ἐπαγγελῇ from an Attic inscription assigned to the fifth century B. C., and adds in a foot-note some further information drawn from the same inscription.
11. p. 128. Henri Weil makes out a fragment of Agathon from Dionysius Hal. Dem. 26.
12. pp. 129-144. The plural of respect in Latin (by Emile Chatelain). After giving the views of several writers on this subject, the author collects examples, beginning with the first that even seem to present this use of *vos, vester* for *tu, tuus*. He concludes that the plural of respect did not exist until the fifth century after Christ, and that it never under any circumstances excluded the use of the singular. He is of opinion that its origin was due to the habit of including other members of the imperial family in addressing emperors.
13. pp. 139-140. Notes on grammar (by O. Riemann). (a) Note on inscription mentioned on p. 58 *Rev. de Phil.* IV. (b) In Xen. Hell. III 4, 1, retain Ἡρώδας, writing it with *φ*. (c) ξυββάλλεσθαι in an Attic inscription. (d) *Tot, quot* employed substantively.
14. p. 140. On Depidii, Defidii (Delfidii), Digidii (by L. Havet).
15. pp. 141-4. Book notices.
16. Appendix: *Revue des Revues*, pp. 1-64. Germany: Bursian's *Jahresbericht*.
M. W. HUMPHREYS.

NEUE JAHRBÜCHER FÜR PHILOGIE U. PAEDAGOGIK. FLECKEISEN u. MASIVS.
1879.

IX.

1. Review of H. Guhrauer's Essay on the History of Flute-music (αὐλοδία) among the Greeks, by K. von Jan (pp. 577-592). The point in dispute is

whether *αὐλοδός* means the flute-player, who would occasionally sing a strain without the accompaniment of a flute, or the singer who was accompanied by the flute-player. G. cites in support of his view of the separate character of the *αὐλητής* and the *αὐλοδός* Plut. de Mus. 8, Paus. X 7, 5, Athen. XIV c. 14, and especially Plut. de Mus. 36, where the reviewer holds that *συμφωνοῦσαν οἱ αὐλοὶ* refers not to the harmony of the flutes with the singer, but of the two parts of the *αὐλός* with each other. (In showing that the *αὐλός* was double he need not have gone to the desperate length of deriving *μόνανλος* from the *Egyptian mam*.) The reviewer tries to show that there was a similarity between the rhapsodic recitation of Homer by Terpander and these *aulodic* recitations. He interprets [incorrectly?] *ἐλεγεία προσδόμενα τοῖς αὐλοῖς*, Paus. X 7, "reciting elegies to the flutes, i. e., after a prelude or with an interlude upon the flute." In tracing the history of flute-music the reviewer admits that in the flourishing period of Greek art singing and playing commonly went together, but he makes [without sufficient evidence] a distinction between the earlier *aulodic nomos* and the later flute-music.

2. Critical Observations on A. Hug's Edition of Plato's Symposium, by Chr. Cron (pp. 593-599).

3. The Scrutiny (*δοκιμασία*) of Magistrates at Athens, by Th. Thalheim (pp. 601-608). From a discussion of Lysias 26, 12 and 6, Dem. 40, 34, Aeschin. 3, 14, 15, Pollux VIII 44, and Deinarchus 2, 10, the writer draws two conclusions as undoubted: (1) that all magistrates *elected by vote* had to pass scrutiny before the Heliastic court; (2) that the law of *δοκιμασία* recognized a distinction between the magistrates who were *elected* and those *chosen by lot*. As probable he holds: (1) that *all* officers chosen by lot appeared for examination (as in the case of the archons) before both the senate and the court; (2) that the relation of the court to the senate in the scrutiny of those chosen to the archonship was that of a court of appeal.

4. Notice of Susseihl's Edition (Greek and German with index and copious notes) of the Politics of Aristotle, by W. Dittenberger (pp. 609-615). Four textual emendations and a few criticisms on the interpretation.

5. Composition of the Group of the Aeginatan Marbles, by Konrad Lange, reviewed by L. Schwabe (pp. 616-620). An interesting notice of an important contribution, as it appears, to the study of ancient art. Prachow, a Russian archaeologist, published in 1873 an essay on this group of statuary, in which he held that a study of the fragments found with the statues *in situ*, and preserved in Munich, warranted the belief that an additional figure leaning forward to rescue the fallen warrior was originally present in each gable. Lange has followed in the path of Prachow, and finds evidence in the thirty-five pieces which seem to belong to the figures of the pediments of the existence of *fourteen* instead of the well-known *eleven* statues in each pediment. The reviewer is convinced by Lange's proofs, and praises the artistic skill with which he disposes the fourteen figures, two rows deep, in the field of the pediment.

6. The Treasure of Ptolemy Philadelphus, by F. Rühl (pp. 621-628). According to a comment of St. Jerome on Daniel xi 5, Ptolemy's revenue from Egypt amounted annually to 14,800 talents (i. e. Alexandrian silver talents). But Appian, Proem. c. 10, states that Ptolemy had in his treasury 740,000 *Egyptian*

talents. The discussion turns upon what is meant by *Egyptian* talents. Droysen takes them to be *silver*, so does Boeckh, who accounts for the surprising disparity between the annual revenue and the immense treasure by supposing that the statement of Appian refers to the sum total of revenues received from all sources during the thirty-eight years of Ptolemy's reign. The writer defends the view of Latronne, who understands these Egyptian talents to be *copper*, making the treasure equal only to 12,333 silver talents.

7. Emendationes [tredecim] Petronii Satirarum, by A. Strelitz (pp. 629-634).

8. On the Ordinarii as represented by Vegetius in his *Epitoma Rei Militaris*, by H. Bruncke (pp. 635-639). The writer shows that Vegetius confounded the Ordinarii of the time of Diocletian with the *antiqua ordinatio* of Hadrian.

9. Emendations to Eutropius, by R. Duncker (pp. 641-656). These twenty emendations deserve careful attention. Many of them are supported by the Greek translation of Paeanius, whose value in the criticism of Eutropius Duncker promises to defend against the attack of Sylburg and others.

In the paedagogical part of this number the article of most general interest is that entitled "Ein angebliches Lautgesetz des Neuhochochdeutschen," in which the difficulties that beset the spelling reform in Germany come to view.

X.

1. Wecklein gives a favorable notice of Prinz's Edition of the *Alcestis*, and adds several conjectural readings, of which the most noteworthy are: *φέγγος* for *μηρὸς* (450), *ἐν νομοῖς* for *ἐν δόμοις* (574), *μεῖζονα ζῶης* for *μεῖζον' ἂν ζῶης* (713).

2. Textual Criticism of Euripides (*Hercul. Fur.* 76-77, 81, *Medea* 160 ff., *Alcest.* 132 ff.), by S. Mekler (pp. 661-668). One illustration of the writer's method must suffice. In the common reading of *Medea* 160, **Ἀρτεμι* is objectionable (cf. 168). Weil conjectures *ὦ μεγάλη Ζεῦ καὶ Θέμι πάντα*. But how are we to explain the transposition of *Θέμι*? Better suppose that of ΠΟΤΝΙΑ ΑΡΤΕΜΙ originally only ΟΝΙΔΑ Ε was genuine, and from this we could make [ΚΡ]ΟΝΙΔΑ [Ζ] Ε [Υ]. The whole line then would read: *ὦ μεγάλη Θέμι καὶ Κρονίδα Ζεῦ!*

3. Thirteen emendations of the text of Solon's fragments, by J. Sitzler (pp. 668-672). Some of these conjectures are ingenious, but are not required either by the sense or the grammar of the traditional reading. A few, like *τέτρωσιν* for *τιμῶσιν* fr. 13, and the changes proposed in fr. 24 (which are corroborated by Theognis 719 ff.), seem worthy of adoption.

4. Pederasty and Sexual Love in Plato's *Symposium*, by M. Wohlrab (pp. 673-684). The writer contends for the quasi natural and unsensual view of *παιδεραστία* presented in the *Symposium*. Socrates speaks of *ὁρθῶς παιδεραστεῖν*. A strong case is made against the interpretation of this Dialogue which is based upon the modern view of pederasty. The consistency and the nobility of the sentiments expressed by Phaedrus, Pausanias, Eryximachus and Aristophanes, are defended against the criticisms of Hug and Rettig.

5. The Tongues of Animals offered in Sacrifice, by P. Stengel (pp. 687-692). From a discussion of Athenaeus I 28, of the scholia on *Odys.* γ 332, Apollonius *Argonaut.* I 517 and Cornutus *περὶ θεῶν* c. 16, the writer concludes that the tongues of victims were not burnt in sacrifice to Hermes, but in the instance of

Odys. γ 332 to Poseidon [cf. Nitzsch and Hayman ad l. c.] and in that of Apoll. Argonaut. to Zeus. From Aristoph. Plutus 1110 and the scholiast (Καλλίστρατος) τῶν θηομένων (φήσι) τὰς γλώσσας τοῖς κήρυξιν ἀπονέμεσθαι, and from two inscriptions, ἦν δὲ θύηται (ὁ ἱερεὺς) λάψεται γλῶσσαν — τῷ ἱερεὶ γλῶσσα κ. τ. ἐ., the writer infers that at one time [when?] it was customary to give the tongue of the victim to the officiating priest or herald.

6. R. Löblich disputes the statement of Christ's Metrik p. 187, that the penthemimeral caesura cuts the hexameter into two nearly equal parts, and maintains that, counting 24 *morae* to the line and two additional for the pauses, this caesura cuts the line into two parts whose proportion is as 10 to 16, which is nearly the same ratio as that between the larger (second) part to the entire line, sc. 16 : 26.

7. From a great many examples P. Egenolff shows that Apollonius Dyscolus, as in his *Scripta Minora* (cf. Fleck. Jahrb. 1878, p. 845), so in his *de Syntaxi* wrote either μέρος λόγον or τὸ μέρος τοῦ λόγου. (pp. 693-698.)

8. Critical discussion and emendation of passages in Lucian's *Tὰ πρὸς Κρόνον* and *Πλοῖον ἢ Εἰχαλ*, by O. Wichmann (pp. 698-700).

9. A critical discussion and emendation of Sallust Jug. 14, 3; 94, 1; 97, 5, by Hellwig and Gneisse (pp. 701-704).

10. Glossae, by G. Löwe (pp. 705-712). Forty-seven in number and supplementary to the author's "Prodromus Corporis Glossariorum Latinorum."

XI.

1. The Pre-Socratic Philosophy, by A. Gladisch (pp. 721-733). An interesting paper, whose aim is to show the popular misconception of this philosophy. After criticizing Hegel's subjective treatment of this period, the writer proceeds to a sharp discussion of Aristotle's statement (Metaph. I 3 f.) of the progressive development of philosophy, the correctness of which he calls in question. Gladisch argues that Thales meant by ἀρχὴ πάντων ὕδωρ not that water is the *origin*, but, as Cic. de Nat. Deorum I 10, 25 has it, "initium rerum." So the ἀήρ of Anaximenes and the πῦρ αἰώνιον of Heraclitus he takes not as the material cause but as the visible symbol of the first cause of the universe, only a shade removed from the more spiritual νόος of Anaxagoras, for which Gladisch claims all the essential attributes of the Hebrew Jehovah.

2. W. H. Roscher makes out a good case for the change of the name of the festival held at Delphi, in honor of Apollo's victory over the Python, from σεπτήριον (of uncertain etymology) to στεπτήριον = feast of crowning.

3. Studies in the Nicomachean Ethics, by F. Susemihl (pp. 737-765). This is an able discussion of the terms ἐπιστημονικόν, λογιστικόν, δοξαστικόν, as applied by Aristotle, at the beginning of the sixth book of the Ethics, to the parts of the rational soul (τὸ λόγον ἔχον). The author thinks that the generally received view which takes τὸ ἐπιστημονικόν as including all the activities of the *theoretic* and τὸ λογιστικόν only those of the *practical* reason, is contradicted by the right interpretation of the language of Aristotle; that τὸ λογιστικόν, while properly called so from one of its activities, sc. λογίζεσθαι = βουλευέσθαι (which is its *practical* side), has also an activity in relation to what is theoretical or scientific and yet not necessary (ἐνδεχόμενον καὶ ἄλλως ἔχειν), and hence may be called also τὸ δοξαστικόν.

4. Wecklein, in commenting on Plato's Apology, decides in favor of Uhle's interpretation of $\mu\acute{\upsilon}\omega\psi$ = "gadfly" against Cron's = "spur," and shows how the double sense in Greek of the word suits the thought of the passage in the Apology.

5. Fleckeisen proposes, for reasons based in part on the metre, to read v. 64, 65 of the Epidicus of Plautus thus:

Quid nunc me retines? istam amatne quam emit dē praeda? rogas?
Immo deperit. Degetur corium de tergo meo.

6. Observationes Criticae in Lucretium, by J. Woltjer (pp. 769-786). This critical paper, in which fifteen emendations are proposed, is the fruit of a careful collation of the Leyden MSS. A and B, and shows remarkable acumen.

7. An attempt by C. Venediger (pp. 786-790) to show that chaps. 7 and 8 of Book III of Caesar's Commentaries, from peculiarities in the diction and in the syntax, are not of Caesar's composition, but constitute one of several instances in which he transcribed literally the documents and reports which formed part of the material of his history. Many of the alleged peculiarities may be charged to the critic's anxiety to prove his point.

8. The Date of the Composition of the Tenth Eclogue of Vergil, by H. Flach (pp. 791-798). From the reading of the first line ("*extremum*") critics regard this as the last written of the Eclogues, without supposing that all were composed in the order of their arrangement. Flach finds evidence in the allusions to Gallus for assuming a date earlier by three to five years (42 B. C.), supposes that the poet subsequently placed this at the end of the collection of Eclogues, either because he thought it possessed but little general interest or was conscious "*dasz das gedicht ein verunglücktes war*," and changed the original reading of the first line so as to indicate by "*extremum*" the present order of the idyll. In the obscurity of the tone and of many of the expressions of this eclogue Flach sees complimentary (!) imitation of the style of Gallus's elegies written after the model of Euphorion.

9. M. Bechert extends the researches of Th. Vogel (vid. Fleck. Jahrb. 1878, p. 393), on the "representative" use in Latin of the preposition *in* (e. g. *in vobis liberos, parentes, consanguineos habeo*), to the Astronomicon of Manilius: with but meagre results, for he finds only three undoubted instances.

XII.

1. The Poet Homer and the Wolfian Hypothesis, by A. Kiene (pp. 801-806). The writer contends for the unity of authorship of the Homeric poetry on the following grounds: (1) The poetic diction and form preserve their identity (leaving unquestioned interpolations out of account) throughout the Iliad and the Odyssey. (2) Both poems contain a consistent and complete action, according to the criteria given by Aristotle (Poetics 24, 7). (3) The Epics of Homer are in the points just named, according to the testimony of Aristotle, far superior to those of the other epic poets. (4) While the other epic poets narrate in their own person, Homer represents the action dramatically and delineates his characters most vividly. The freshest feature of the paper is the discussion of the "*gestaltende kraft der sage*" in the consistent portrayal of character.

2. J. Golisch shows the absurdity of supposing that the preposition $\pi\rho\acute{o}$ origi-

nally meant "with the back towards" by applying this sense in such passages as Xen. Hellen. VII 1, 30, Plut. Themist. 15, and in others.

3. K. J. Liebhold discusses the interpretation of *ἱερῶν καὶ ὁσιῶν* Thuc. II 52, and of *ἄξιον τοῦ παρὰ πολλὸν πρέξεν* Thuc. II 89.

4. Review of Wieseler's critical annotations on the Cyclops of Euripides, by J. Kvičala (pp. 809-815). Some of Wieseler's emendations are highly commended. In v. 591 and v. 648 the traditional text is defended.

5. Another attempt is made, this time by J. Sitzler, to make respectable Greek and good sense of the Epigram found in Dem. de Corona, § 289. Most noteworthy is the proposal to strike out vv. 5, 6 as a gloss on *ἀντιπάλων ὕβριν ἀπεκίδασαν*.

6. Cron comes once more to the rescue of his interpretation of *μίωψ* in the Apology, in answer to the criticism of Wecklein noticed above under XI 4.

7. P. Stengel shows good evidence for writing the name of the courier in Herod. VI 105, *Φιλипπίδης* instead of *Φειδιππίδης*.

8. L. Mendelssohn, in a criticism on an emendation in Appian by Roscher, shows the danger of proposing changes in the text without a thorough acquaintance with the usage of an author. So, e. g., Usener proposes to change *ἐθνῶν* into *σθμῶν* in App. Prooem. 3, plainly unconscious that Appian elsewhere uses *ἐθνος* in the sense of *country* and as a translation of *provincia*.

9. Review of C. Hoffmann's dissertation *de Verborum Transpositionibus in Cornificii Rhetoricum ad C. Herennium Libris*, by A. Römer (pp. 823-832). The Rhetoric of Cornificius gives us the *τέχνη* of Roman oratory in its purest form, and ought to be more widely known. After praising the acumen and soundness of the dissertation, the reviewer discusses five passages in which he dissents from the conclusions of H. He agrees in charging Cicero with indebtedness to Cornificius for "de Inventione," and subscribes to the remark of L. Spengel: "derselbe (Cicero) glaubt es immer anders und besser machen zu müssen (als Cornificius), macht es aber gewöhnlich schlechter."

10. Emendationes [una et viginti] Petronii Satirarum, by A. Strelitz. This critical paper in Latin is followed by one in German, written by E. Rohde, in which conjectural readings of nineteen passages in Petronius are discussed. (pp. 833-848.)

11. R. Thimin shows that the statement of C. Wagener (Fl. Jahrb. p. 271), "that in the perfect forms of verbs in *eo* and their compounds the *v* is always syncopated and *ii* is contracted when followed by *s*," is corroborated by the usage of Suetonius.

12. This number closes with two critical papers on the Commentaries of Caesar and their Supplement, the first written by C. Fleischer, the second by O. Schambach in review of a former paper by Fleischer (Fl. Jahrb. 1878, pp. 273-282) on the same topic. F.'s article shows thorough acquaintance with the textual criticism of Caesar, and offers many plausible emendations. A footnote of the editor gives the opinion of W. von Humboldt that "Berones" mentioned in Bellum Alex. 53, 1, is not to be taken there as the name of a people, but as the Celtic word for *armed men*, and is connected with the Welch word *ber* = spear.

M. L. D'OOGHE.

HERMES. 1880. No. 1.

1. H. Jordan. Notes in Linguistic Development. Jordan doubts the etymology of *esquiliae* as from *exquillae* opposed to *inquilinus* [Mommson]; he doubts whether any such weakening of *x* is to be assumed for archaic Latin [exfocient, Duilius column]. It would rather have become *ec-quillae*, *equillae*, although even Varro in his time suggested the above etymology. J. then discusses how *pomerium* came from *po-mœrium*. In a bronze tablet from Lacus Fucinus the form *doivom* occurs from *deivom*, *devom*, *divum*; cf. Gr. *Foivos* *vînum*, *Foîkos* *vîcus*. The series then probably was: *moiros*, *murus*, *meiros*, *po[s]-merium*. Query: is *mei-moi-rus* merely augmentation of Indo-European *i*, or is *ei* a secondary affection of *oi*? These explanations of course cannot be based on the phonetic practice of classical Latin.

2. Inscription from Lago Fucino with facsimile: *caso, cantovios, aprufscano ceip apurfinem esalico menurbid casontonio socieque doivom atoierdattia pro. l . . nibus martses*. Probable time before 250 B. C. Provincial (Marsian) Latin; a dedication by some Marsian legions.

4. On *olea olîva*. Query: is it borrowed from *ἐλαιον*, or is it a case of ancestral kinship? Cato de Re Rustica uses *olea* and *oleum* and *oletum* only, [not *olîva*]; *oleitas* *olearius* *oleaginus*; once only *olivetum*. But Plautus *olivum olîva*; *olîva* would seem to be an adjective form. It cannot as yet be decided whether *olea* should be considered a word borrowed from *ἐλαια*.

E. Stutzer [Barmen]. The time of composition of some Lysian Orationes, especially 7, 14, 18, 21, 25. For 7 he arrives at 396 B. C. (the reading of § 10 being controverted); for 21 he gets 403 B. C. as terminus post quem; for 18 not later than 397 B. C. nor earlier than 402. No. 25 was written between 404 and 402, at all events after the expedition against the oligarchs at Eleusis.

E. Hübner (the editor). Citania: Antiquities in Portugal. Citania is near Braza in Northern Portugal, province of Douro e Minho. The name *Citania* occurs several times in localities of Northern Portugal, but about its age or its form in classic times (if any) nothing can now be confidently stated. In the ancient writers the name does not occur. The ruins of Citania are on a mountain almost entirely detached from the range of the Falperra. This mountain bears three concentric circular walls of about two metres in breadth. Some eight to nine paved roads lead to the mountain and there cross each other. Mr. Sarmiento, the owner of the land, has caused excavations to be made with the following results. There have been found: circular cabins, the doors of which seem to have been in the rear, away from the road; a few huts are square or oblong. Further: stone troughs and rings in the wall, suggesting cattle; a highly ornamented slab, with crude ornamentation of a very early stage, 2.90 m. high, 2.80 m. broad, and 0.24 m. thick. The use of this slab is much disputed, some Portuguese archaeologists thinking of the surface of an altar; Prof. H. himself suggests a sepulchral monument. Further: stone pillars, stone thresholds; a few bases of columns, unmistakably in Graeco-Roman style; stones with linear, geometrical, circular and spiral ornamentation, reminding one of the later Celtic type: fragments of very rudely sculptured heads: two nude figures in relief, one pursuing the other: Inscriptions: *Coroneri Camali domus*, sepulchral, H. thinks: another: *Coru . . . abe Medamus Camali*. The A M A L

incised thus: AA a monogrammatic shift. *Camalus* appears everywhere in these inscriptions. Pottery: these fragments, too, repeat the name of *Camalus*. Other fragments, of finer pottery, are probably of imported goods, with Roman stamp. A few small coins (municipal, Northern Spain, time of Augustus and Tiberius). All these relics point to a small native oppidum, whose inhabitants, faintly touched by the civilization of the Roman conquerors, lived on in their native and primitive way. No stone implements or remnants of a bronze period have been found. Summing up, Hübner points to analogies of Celtic remains in Gaul.

T. H. Mordtmann (Pera). Archaic Inscription from Kyzikos. This inscription is boustrophedon, and Mordtmann puts it down for about 520-510 B. C. Kyzikos was a Milesian colony, the dialect of the inscription is pure old Ionic. The subject-matter is a decree of partial *ἀπέλευσις* and of the privilege of free dining in the city hall. *δέδοται* is used in active sense. The slab is now in the museum of the Greek Philological Society at Constantinople.

Mommsen (Th.), p. 99 sqq., on Porcia. Porcia, the wife of M. Brutus (literary friend of Cicero, constitutionalist, etc.), married her husband after the death of her first husband Bibulus, Consul 59 B. C. Bibulus died 48 B. C., leaving at least two sons by Porcia. One of these was studying at Athens in 45 B. C., and was born therefore about 63 B. C. Therefore his mother Porcia cannot well have been born later than 81 B. C. But Cato Uticensis, the *reputed* father of Porcia, was born in 95 B. C., only 14 years before. Appian alone (probably after Asinius Pollio) makes her the *sister* of Cato Uticensis. It is very remarkable that all the other authors have the wrong statement, Valerius Maximus, Martial, Plutarch, Cassius Dio. Mommsen quotes *Shakespeare* (Julius Caesar) as the most potent and probably most permanent repository of the mistaken tradition, and assumes a wilful falsification on the part of the authority from which Plutarch (Cato Minor) drew his data.

Mommsen (Th.) Horace's letters on Literature (Ep. II). It is the date of their composition which M. discusses, calling them "the most graceful and enjoyable work in all Roman literature" (p. 103). M. weighs the indicia for the first Epistle and makes the year 13 B. C. For the second Epistle he assumes 19-18 B. C. The date of No. 3 (ad Pisones) remains uncertain.

Jordan. The "Parabasis" in Plautus Curculio, IV 1 (cf. Hermes, 1867, 89 sqq.). This is the sketch of life on the Roman forum. J's paper, which is partly antiquarian and partly hermeneutical and critical, comes to the conclusion that the lines in question are not Plautine. At the same time antiquarian considerations prompt J. to set the interpolation prior to 153 B. C.

Ed. Zeller. The Pseudophilonian report on Theophrastus. Z. assumes for this treatise (*περί ἀφθαρσίας κόσμου*) an author and also a later interpolator, whose work (turgid padding) it is an easy task to remove from the body of the discourse. The author seems to have lived about 50 B. C., at Alexandria, and shows good reading of Plato, the Stoics Chrysippus, Panaetius, Boethus, the Pythagorean Ocellus Lucanus, etc. The point of Zeller's present paper is this: Z. reasserts his belief that the arguments, quoted as from Theophrastus, for the eternity of the world (*ἀφθαρσία*) are genuine, and that at the time of their pub-

lication by Theophrastus they were actually directed against his younger contemporary, Zeno, the head of the rising Stoic school at Athens. This point has recently been controverted by H. Diels in his recent voluminous and erudite publication, *Doxographi Graeci* (Reimer, Berlin), a work crowned by the Berlin Academy and highly commended by Zeller himself.

Ernst Curtius. Harmodius and Aristogeiton. The late archaeologist, Count Stackelberg, found a marble chair at Athens, in relief, the figures of two warriors hastening forward. He called them Harmodius and Aristogeiton. The late Professor Friederichs discovered at Naples a copy of these reliefs in full statues. The view that these represent the two tyrannicides has been maintained by Friederichs, Schwabe, Petersen, Overbeck, but it never satisfied E. Curtius. He now points out both other incongruities and the fact that no arrangement of the two whatsoever brings about a group. He himself takes them for Miltiades and Callimachus at Marathon in the assault, Paus. I 15, copied from the famous painting of Panainos in the Stoa Poikilê. Curtius professes to have been greatly strengthened in his view by the fact that the two figures have recently been discovered on a vase, the "Lekythos Sercunang," edited by Petersen.

E. G. SIKLER.

LANX SATURA.

In the last number of Kuhn's *Zeitschrift* Karl Brugman discusses the etymology of some Greek words. To the generally accepted derivation of *δευτερος* as a comparative formation of *δυο*, *duataras *δφέτερος, he objects that the *v* is not thus accounted for; for *δφέτερος* should reduce to *δέτερος as *δφουός* to *δουός*. The suggestion of Savelsberg that *δευτερος* is for an older *δύντερος and that of Westphal that the *ev* is a "diphthongische Verstärkung von *v* zu *ev*" are both untenable. The use of the superlative form as in T 51 *αὐτὰρ ὁ δέυτατος ἦλθεν ἀναξ ἀνδρῶν Ἀγαμέμνων*, and in a 286, ψ 342, requires the meaning "novissimus" which can only by forcing be got out of "second." And the employment of *δευτερος* itself with the construction of a comparative is not satisfactorily explained from its sense as a numeral. Cf. Dem. XIX 24, *πάντα γὰρ τὰλλα δεύτερα ἦν τῶν ὑποκειμένων προσδοκιῶν καὶ τῶν ἐλπίδων* (Thuc. II 97, 5, Hdt. I 23). Ψ 248 *οἱ κεν ἐμεῖο δέυτεροι* (=ἐμοῦ ὕστεροι) *ἐν νήεσσι πολυκλήμει λίπησθε* (H 248, Ψ 605, Pind. Ol. I 43). These passages show that *δευτερος* and *δέυτατος* are much more than mere numerals. It is more probable that, standing originally outside of the numeral series, like the Latin *secundus*, they made their way into it in Greek, than that the simple idea of "two" should develop itself into a predicate so full of meaning as seen above. The explanation, therefore, of the old grammarians is to be preferred who find the origin of the words in *δεύομαι*, and with whom of the moderns Doederlein agrees (Hom. Gl. 153.). *Δεύομαι* and *δέω* are to be connected with the Sans. *dūrā*, "far" (chiefly in a local sense), compar. *ddvīyas*, superl. *ddvishṭha*; and so *δεύομαι* *τινος* means